

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 19 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled and incorporated into claim 1. That is, claim 1 is now a combination of the original version of claim 1 and claim 7. Claims 4 and 5 has been canceled and incorporated into claim 2. That is, claim 2 is now a combination of the original version of claim 2 and claim 4.

The Examiner stated that the drawings are objected to under 37CFR1.83(a).

Responsive to this, reference number (25) is added to Fig. 1 of the corrected drawing to indicate the side cutouts defined in the front end of the cover (20). The resilient separator is shown in Figs. 1, 2 and 4 as the O-ring (282). The channels are shown in Figs. 1 and 4 as the inlet (22), the first outlet (24) and the second outlet (26) extending to communicate with the inner opening of the resilient separator, which is the O-ring (282). The dovetail recess is shown in Figs. 1 and 4 as the recess (12), which has a width tapering toward the top of the recess (12). With the amendment of Fig. 1 and the foregoing explanations, the applicant believes that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) has been overcome. For further clarification, reference numbers (221, 241, 261) are added to Fig. 1 of the corrected drawing.

The amendments mentioned above in the specification are made to improve clarification and consistency.

The Examiner stated that claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully addresses the above-noted rejections.

The Examiner stated that it is unclear what structure allows the cover to be pivotally mounted on the base. Responsive to this, in amended claim 1, the “and a pivotal post (11) formed near the rear end” is inserted after “the front end.” Furthermore, “a cutout (21) defined at the rear end to receive the pivotal post (11) of the base (10), a pin (111) penetrating the cover (20) at the cutout (21) and the pivotal post (11) to pivotally combine the cover (20) and the base (10), an annular trench (28) defined in the bottom of the cover,” is inserted after “the base (10) and has” to describe the structure about how the cover (20) is mounted pivotally on the base (10).

The Examiner stated that it is also unclear what structure constitutes a “resilient separator” and how it is related to the cover. Responsive to this, claim 7 is incorporated into claim 1. In amended claim 1, the “an annular trench (28) defined in the bottom of the cover,” is added to claim 1. Furthermore, “, which is an O-ring (282) and is partially received in the annular trench (28)” is inserted after “a resilient separator with an inner opening” to describe the resilient separator and how it is related to the cover (20).

The Examiner stated that it is unclear what is meant by “to communicate with” of the multiple channels. Responsive to this, in amended claim 1, the “and each having an opening at an area within the annular trench (28)” is inserted after “the cover (20)” to clarify how the multiple channels communicate with the inner opening of the resilient separator. The above description is shown in the corrected drawing as the openings (221, 241, 261) and is added into the detailed description.

The Examiner stated that Applicant has not provided structural elements to the recess (12) that would limit the recess (12) to accommodate only a working electrode. Responsive to this, in amended claim 1, the “to adapt to receive a working electrode” for the recess (12) is deleted from claim 1.

Accordingly, the applicant believes that amended claim 1 clearly describes the structure of the invention and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

The Examiner stated that it is unclear how a ball is “retractably mounted” inside the locating posts in claim 2. Responsive to this, claim 4 is incorporated into claim 2 to clearly describe how a ball (186) is retractably mounted inside a corresponding locating post (14). Accordingly, the applicant believes that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

Claim 7 has been canceled and incorporated into claim 1 to clarify the structure claimed in claim 1.

The Examiner stated that claims 8-10 are unclear in what constitutes a full channel. Responsive to this, in amended claims 8-10, the “and having an opening (221) at the area within the annular trench (28)” is inserted after “the cover (20) from the top”. The “and having an opening (241) at the area within the annular trench (28)” is inserted after “the cover (20) from one side”. Furthermore, the “and having an opening (261) at the area within the annular trench (28)” is inserted after “the cover (20) from another side” to clarify how the inlet (22), the first outlet (24) and the second outlet (26) respectively constitute a full channel. The above description is also shown in the corrected drawing as the openings

(221, 241, 261). The inlet (22), the first outlet (24) and the second outlet (26) all have the same feature as the multiple channels claimed in amended claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

The Examiner stated that in the claims it is unclear what further structure constitutes a dovetail recess. Responsive to this, in amended claim 18, the “having a width tapering toward the top of the recess (12)” is inserted after “a dovetail recess” to clarify what further structure constitutes a dovetail recess. The above description is also shown in Figs. 1 and 4. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

Therefore, the applicant believes that the rejections of other claims depending on the foregoing allowable claims under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, have also been overcome.

The Examiner stated that claims 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Ahern, Jr. et al. (5,826,718), hereafter Ahern, Jr. Applicant respectfully addresses the above-noted rejections.

Responsive to this, claim 7 is incorporated into claim 1. With the amendment to claim 1, the cover (20) has an annular trench (28) defined in the bottom of the cover (20) and has a resilient separator with an inner opening, which is an O-ring (282) and is partially received in the annular trench (28) of the cover (20). In addition, the multiple channels defined in the cover (20) and each has an opening at an area within the annular trench (28). Therefore, Ahern, Jr. does not disclose, teach or anticipate the features described in amended claim 1

of this application. The invention in amended claim 1 of this application cannot be implemented by the prior art. Applicant believes that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome and the amended claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 19 has been amended and depends on the allowable amended claim 1. Applicant believes that the rejection to claim 19 has been overcome and the amended claim 19 is allowable.

After the amendment to the claims, the indefinite and anticipation rejections under 37 CFR 1.83(a), 35 U.S.C 112 and 35 U.S.C 102(b) are overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

/David E. Dougherty/

David E. Dougherty